

REMARKS

Claims 25-41 are presented for examination in this application. Claim 25 has been amended to depend on new claim 36. As to the amendments to claims 27 and 28 reciting “representative value,” see Applicants’ specification, e.g., at page 14, lines 5-6, 20-21. As to new independent claim 36 added above, see, e.g., Applicants’ specification at page 43, lines 1-11 (claim 1) and lines 19-21 (claim 3); Applicants’ specification at page 8, line 21; page 9, lines 3, 11; page 20, lines 5-6; page 21, lines 1-2; page 22, lines 8 and 14; page 23, line 11; page 25, line 3. As to new claim 37 above, see, e.g., Applicants’ specification at page 20, line 7; page 21, lines 2 and 21; page 22, lines 8-9 and 14. As to new claim 38, see Applicants’ specification at page 20. As to new claims 39-41, see original claims 26-28.

At page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 25-26, 29-31 and 34-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murano et al., Japanese document no. 06-252450.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection.

In Applicants’ claimed invention of Claim 25, as amended above to depend on new Claim 36, “the array has the gradient index rod lens aligned at an average spacing of 1 μm to 5 μm .” Murano fails to teach or disclose alignment at an average spacing as recited in Applicants’ claim 25.

In independent claim 26, a representative value for center-line-average roughness is obtained for each lens and the average of the representative values is between 0.5-2.0 μm . Claim 26 is thus distinguished from Murano.¹

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection are respectfully requested.

At page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 27-28 and 32-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murano et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection.

Claims 27 and 28 define a standard deviation of the representative values obtained from each lens. Thus, claims 27-28 define the representative value for

¹Claims 29-31 and 34-35 are dependent and are distinguished from Murano for at least the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 26.

each lens in the whole lens array. That is, the present invention is directed to set dispersion of roughness or diameter in a predetermined range among the lenses in a lens array.

In contrast, Murano does not teach controlling the average-roughness in a predetermined range among plural lenses. Murano merely teaches roughening the side face of the lens to suppress flare light in a desired average roughness. Although Murano shows a lens array, Murano's teaching on roughness is directed to the individual lenses.

There is certainly no teaching in Murano to set roughness or diameter in a predetermined range among the lens in a lens array.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 25-41 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephone or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041 (Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.).

Respectfully submitted,



Mary E. Goulet
Reg. No. 35,884

WHITHAM CURTIS &
CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Rd., Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190

Tel. 703-787-9400